



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/687,262	10/11/2000	Abraham S. Farag	04860.P2525X	1362

7590 05/02/2003

Andrew C Chen
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, JENNIFER T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/687,262

Applicant(s)

FARAG ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer T Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to Amendment filed on 02/20/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siddiqui (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,013) in view of Pejic et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,018).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 9, 14 and 20, referring to Figs. 4 and 5, Siddiqui teaches a computer mouse (100) comprising: a base member (300); a top member (200) pivotally coupled to said base member (300) (col. 7, lines 15-27).

Siddiqui differs from claims 1, 2, 9, 14 and 20 in that he does not specifically teach top member forms an integral housing and button and the base member having hold regions and the top member having a main surface configured to leave said hold regions substantially exposed. However, top member forms an integral housing and button is well known in the art, as noted by Applicant (see specification page 6, lines 14-15) and referring to Fig. 1D, Pejic teaches base member having hold regions (30) and the top member having a main surface configured to leave said hold regions (30) substantially exposed (col. 2, lines 19-20 and col. 5, lines 24-27, and lines 31-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the top member forms an integral housing and button and the base member having hold regions and the top member having a main surface configured to leave

Art Unit: 2674

said hold regions substantially exposed as taught by conventional art and Pejic in the system of Siddiqui in order to provide more comfortable mouse usage for a variety of users and allow a user to continue a click and drag operation by lifting and repositioning the mouse while maintaining the mouse button in a clicked position.

Regarding claims 3, 4, 12, 13 and 15, the combination of Siddiqui and Pejic teaches the computer mouse, wherein said hold regions (30) allow said top member to be maintained in a clicked position when the computer mouse is removed from a surface and said hold regions are substantially flush with said main surface of said top member (see figure 1D of Pejic, and lines 1-2 and 10-13 of abstract section).

Regarding claims 5 and 8, it would have been obvious to obtain the hold regions comprise first and second vertically extending tabs located on opposite sides of the base member in order to provide a mouse that may be used easily by users having different hand sizes or different degree of coordination.

Regarding claim 6, it would have been obvious to obtain the first and second vertically extending tabs are integrally formed with the base member in order to reduce the size, weight and the cost of the device.

Regarding claim 7, it would have been obvious to obtain the top member comprises first and second opening shaped to accommodate said first and second vertically extending tabs, respectively in order to provide a mouse that may be used easily by users having different hand sizes or different degree of coordination.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, it would have been obvious to obtain the first and second side ears are substantially rigid and first and second side ears are capable of accommodating a

Art Unit: 2674

user's thumb and one of a user's other fingers in order to provide user more comfortable and easy for lift the device to hold and use it in space or to grip the device and use it while on a supporting surface.

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Siddiqui and Pejic teaches the computer mouse wherein said first and second fixed portions (figure 1D of Pejic) and said depressible housing are capable of being held concurrently to lift the computer mouse off a surface (col. 5, lines 31-34 of Pejic).

Regarding claims 17-19, the combination of siddiqui and Pejic differs from claims 17-19 in that it does not specifically teaches an adjuster coupled to the base member, said adjuster to control a force required to push said top member. However, it would have been obvious to obtain an adjuster coupled to the base member, said adjuster to control a force required to push said top member in order to increase or decrease the force required to depress on the top member to effect a mouse click.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jennifer T. Nguyen** whose telephone number is **703-305-3225**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard A Hjerpe** can be reach at **703-305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2674

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks


Washington, DC. 20231

Or faxed to: 703-872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, sixth-floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is 703-306-0377.

Jennifer T. Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2674



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600